

REMARKS

In the Office Action the Examiner rejected all claims 1-17 under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being obvious. Claims 15-17 remain in the application.

The Examiner used Meier as the reference for showing obviousness. Applicants have amended independent claims 15 and 16 to clarify the distinctions between applicants' invention and Meier. Meier does teach sending and receiving leave and join messages on a network. The operation in Meier is in the context of an approach in which the stations (clients) rejoin when a switch (as distinct from a station) sends a "leave\_all" message. This is the type of operation that causes a delay that the applicants are overcoming. The Applicants have not found any teaching in Meier that includes the ability for one client device to respond to the leave message of another client device much less to respond to the detected leave message with a join message. Accordingly, applicants submit that the claims as amended are patentably distinct from Meier.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

Applicants believe the application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully solicited. Please contact the below-signed if there are any issues regarding this communication or otherwise concerning the current application.


Respectfully submitted,

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Freescale Semiconductor, Inc.  
Law Department

Customer Number: 23125

By:

  
James L. Clingan, Jr.

Attorney of Record

Reg. No.: 30,163

Telephone: (512) 996-6839

Fax No.: (512) 996-6854